

3-TUPLES HAVE AT MOST 7 PRIME FACTORS INFINITELY OFTEN

JAMES MAYNARD

ABSTRACT. Let L_1, L_2, L_3 be integer linear functions with no fixed prime divisor. We show there are infinitely many n for which the product $L_1(n)L_2(n)L_3(n)$ has at most 7 prime factors, improving a result of Porter. We do this by means of a weighted sieve based upon the Diamond-Halberstam-Richert multidimensional sieve.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider a set of integer linear functions

$$(1.1) \quad L_i(x) = a_i x + b_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, k\}.$$

We say such a set of functions is *admissible* if their product has no fixed prime divisor. That is, for every prime p there is an integer n_p such that none of $L_i(n_p)$ are a multiple of p . We are interested in the following conjecture.

Conjecture (Prime k -tuples Conjecture). *Given an admissible set of integer linear functions $L_i(x)$ ($i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$), there are infinitely many integers n for which all the $L_i(n)$ are prime.*

With the current technology it appears impossible to prove any case of the prime k -tuples conjecture for $k \geq 2$.

Although we cannot prove that the functions are simultaneously prime infinitely often, we are able to show that they are *almost prime* infinitely often, in the sense that their product has only a few prime factors. This was most notably achieved by Chen [1] who showed that there are infinitely many primes p for which $p + 2$ has at most 2 prime factors. His method naturally generalises to show that for a pair of admissible functions the product $L_1(n)L_2(n)$ has at most 3 prime factors infinitely often.

Similarly sieve methods can prove analogous results for any k . We can show that the product of k admissible functions $L_1(n) \dots L_k(n)$ has at most r_k prime factors infinitely often, for some explicitly given value of r_k . We see that the prime k -tuples conjecture is equivalent to showing we can have $r_k = k$ for all k . The current best values of r_k grow asymptotically like $k \log k$ and explicitly for small k we can take $r_2 = 3$ (Chen, [1]), $r_3 = 8$ (Porter, [7]), $r_4 = 11$, $r_5 = 15$, $r_6 = 18$, $r_7 = 22$, $r_8 = 26$, $r_9 = 30$, $r_{10} = 34$ (Maynard, [4]). Heath-Brown [3] showed that infinitely often there are k -tuples where all the functions L_i have individually at most $C \log k$ prime factors, for an explicit constant C .

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11N05, 11N35, 11N36.
Supported by EPSRC Doctoral Training Grant EP/P505216/1 .

2. MAIN RESULTS

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$ be an admissible 3-tuple of integer linear functions. Then there are infinitely many n for which the product $L_1(n)L_2(n)L_3(n)$ has at most 7 prime factors.*

Results such as Theorem 2.1 which show that k -tuples take few prime factors infinitely often tend to use weighted sieves. When $k = 2$ the best results fix one of the functions to attain a prime value, and use a $k - 1$ dimensional sieve to show that the remaining functions have few prime factors infinitely often. When $k \geq 4$ better bounds are obtained by instead using a k -dimensional sieve on all the factors. When $k = 3$ both approaches can show that a 3-tuple has at most 8 prime factors infinitely often. In this paper we mix these two approaches, using k -dimensional sieves to estimate some terms and $k - 1$ dimensional sieves to estimate other terms. This is the key innovation which allows us to reduce the bound r_3 from 8 to 7.

A similar mixed approach can be used to gain an improvement over the traditional approach when $k \geq 4$, but in this case we find it is superior to use a slightly different argument based on the Selberg sieve, and in the author's work [4].

Theorem 2.1 follows almost immediately from the following proposition, which may be viewed as a sharpening of Halberstam and Diamond's Theorem 11.1 in [2], tailored to our specific application.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be an admissible k -tuple of integer linear functions. Let r_k be a natural number satisfying*

$$r_k > \max(N(u, v; k), uk - 1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} N(u, v; k) &= uk - 1 + \frac{k}{f_k(v)} \left(I_1 - I_2 - \frac{e^\gamma(u-1)}{v} f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) \right), \\ I_1 &= \int_{1/v}^{1/u} \min \left(F_k(v - vs), e^\gamma F_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) w(v - vs) \right) \frac{1 - us}{s} ds, \\ I_2 &= \int_{1/u}^{1-1/v} \max \left(f_k(v - vs), e^\gamma f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) w(v - vs) \right) \frac{us - 1}{s} ds, \end{aligned}$$

and u, v are real numbers satisfying $v/(v-1) < u < v$ and $v > \beta_k$.

Then there are infinitely many n for which the product $L_1(n) \dots L_k(n)$ has at most r_k prime factors.

Here F_k and f_k are the upper and lower sieve functions from the k -dimensional Diamond-Halberstam-Richert sieve (described in detail in [2][Chapter 6]), and β_k is the sifting limit of f_k . $w(u)$ is the Buchstab function defined by the delay differential equation given by (4.36).

In [2][Theorem 11.1] one has a similar result but instead of $N(u, v; k)$ one has the expression

$$(2.1) \quad uk - 1 + \frac{k}{f_k(v)} \int_{1/v}^{1/u} F_k(v - vs) \frac{1 - us}{s} ds.$$

We can see that certainly whenever $f_{k-1}(v/2) > 0$ Proposition 2.2 gives a superior bound. The optimal choice of u and v when using [2][Theorem 11.1] with $k = 3$ is approximately $u = 1.5$, $v = 12$, and since with these values $f_2(v/2) > 0$ we expect a small improvement.

Using numerical integration we can establish Theorem 2.1 from Proposition 2.2. We consider a 3-tuple of integer linear functions, and take $u = 2$, $v = 12$. We find that

$$(2.2) \quad N(2, 12; 3) = 6.943 \dots$$

and so we may take $r_k = 7$ in Proposition 2.2.

We note that the proof of Proposition 2.2 makes much use of the fact we are dealing with integer linear functions for which much more is known about the distribution of the values they take - Diamond and Halberstam's Theorem 11.1 holds in much more general circumstances. This also gives no change to the asymptotic bound of $k \log k + O(k)$ for the number of prime factors of a k -tuple when k is large.

3. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.2

To simplify the argument we adopt a normalisation of our functions, as done originally by Heath-Brown [3]. Since we are only interested in the showing any admissible k -tuple has at most r_k prime factors infinitely often (for some explicit r_k), by considering the functions $L_i(An + B)$ instead of $L_i(n)$ for suitably chosen constants A and B , we may assume without loss of generality that our functions satisfy the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1. $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ is an admissible k -tuple of linear functions. The functions $L_i(n) = a_i n + b_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq k$) are distinct with $a_i > 0$. Each of the coefficients a_i is composed of the same primes none of which divides the b_j . If $i \neq j$, then any prime factor of $a_i b_j - a_j b_i$ divides each of the a_i .

Let $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ be an admissible k -tuple satisfying Hypothesis 1. We view this k -tuple as fixed, and so any implied constants from $\ll$ or O -notation may depend on the k -tuple without explicit reference. We define

$$(3.1) \quad \Pi(n) = \prod_{i=1}^k L_i(n),$$

$$(3.2) \quad A = \prod_{i=1}^k a_i,$$

$$(3.3) \quad v_p(\mathcal{L}) = \#\{1 \leq n < p : \Pi(n) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}\}.$$

By Hypothesis 1 we have

$$(3.4) \quad v_p(\mathcal{L}) = \begin{cases} k, & p \nmid A, \\ 0, & p \mid A. \end{cases}$$

Finally we define the quantity

$$(3.5) \quad P(z) = \prod_{p < z} p.$$

We consider the sum

$$(3.6) \quad S = S(\tau; N, z) = \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1}} (\tau - \Omega(\Pi(n))).$$

If for some fixed constant τ we can show $S(\tau; N, z) > 0$ (for suitable z, N), then there must be an $n \in [N, 2N]$ such that $\Omega(\Pi(n)) < \tau$. Thus if we can show $S(\tau; z, N) > 0$ for all sufficiently large N (with suitable z depending on N) then there are infinitely many n such that $\Omega(\Pi(n)) \leq \lfloor \tau \rfloor$.

We first split the sum S up as a weighted sum over the prime factors of each of the functions $L_j(n)$, based on a new parameter y .

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} S &= \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1}} (\tau - \Omega(\Pi(n))) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1}} \left(\tau - \frac{\log \Pi(n)}{\log y} - \sum_{p|\Pi(n)} \left(1 - \frac{\log p}{\log y} \right) \right) + O \left(\sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ \Pi(n) \text{ not square-free}}} \log N \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1}} \left(\tau - k \frac{\log N}{\log y} + O \left(\frac{1}{\log y} \right) - \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{p|L_j(n)} \left(1 - \frac{\log p}{\log y} \right) \right) + O(S'). \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$(3.8) \quad S' = \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ \Pi(n) \text{ not square-free}}} \log N$$

We reverse the order of summation over p and n , and split the contribution up depending on whether the terms are positive or negative.

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} S &= \left(\tau - k \frac{\log N}{\log y} + O \left(\frac{1}{\log y} \right) \right) \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1}} 1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{z \leq p < y} \left(1 - \frac{\log p}{\log y} \right) \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ p|L_j(n)}} 1 \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{y \leq p < 2a_j N + b_j} \left(\frac{\log p}{\log y} - 1 \right) \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ p|L_j(n)}} 1 + O(S_1). \end{aligned}$$

We notice that the inner sum in the final term makes a contribution only if $L_j(n)$ is a multiple of p and has all prime factors of size at least z . Therefore either $p \leq L_j(n)/z$ and $L_j(n)$ has prime factors other than p , or $L_j(n) = p$. We split the term depending on which of these two is the case.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{y \leq p < 2a_j N + b_j} \left(\frac{\log p}{\log y} - 1 \right) \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ p|L_j(n)}} 1 &= \sum_{y \leq p < 2a_j N/z} \left(\frac{\log p}{\log y} - 1 \right) \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ p|L_j(n)}} 1 + O(1) \\
 (3.10) \quad &+ \left(\frac{\log N}{\log y} - 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log y} \right) \right) \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ L_j(n) \text{ prime}}} 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into (3.9) gives

$$(3.11) \quad S = S_1 - S_2 + S_3 + S_4 + O(S') + O(1),$$

where

$$(3.12) \quad S_1 = \left(\tau - k \frac{\log N}{\log y} + O\left(\frac{1}{\log y} \right) \right) \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1}} 1,$$

$$(3.13) \quad S_2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{z \leq p < y} \left(1 - \frac{\log p}{\log y} \right) \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ p|L_j(n)}} 1,$$

$$(3.14) \quad S_3 = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{y \leq p < 2a_j N/z} \left(\frac{\log p}{\log y} - 1 \right) \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ p|L_j(n)}} 1,$$

$$(3.15) \quad S_4 = \left(\frac{\log N}{\log y} - 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log y} \right) \right) \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ L_j(n) \text{ prime}}} 1.$$

We wish to use the Diamond-Halberstam-Richert k -dimensional sieve to get lower bounds for S_1 , S_3 and S_4 and an upper bound for S_2 . We use a simple upper bound to show S' is negligible. This will then give a lower bound for our sum S .

We summarize these results in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $N > N_0$ and u, v be constants satisfying $\tau > uk$, $1 < v/(v-1) < u < v$. Let*

$$V(z) = \prod_{\substack{p < z \\ p \nmid A}} \left(1 - \frac{k}{p} \right), \quad y = N^{1/u}, \quad z = N^{1/v}.$$

Then we have

$$(3.16) \quad S_1 \geq (\tau - ku)NV(z)f_k(v) + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right),$$

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} S_2 &\leq kNV(z) \int_{1/v}^{1/u} \min\left(F_k(v - vs), e^\gamma F_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right)w(v - vs)\right) \frac{1 - us}{s} ds \\ &\quad + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right), \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} S_3 &\geq kNV(z) \int_{1/u}^{1-1/v} \max\left(f_k(v - vs), e^\gamma f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right)w(v - vs)\right) \frac{us - 1}{s} ds \\ &\quad + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right), \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.19) \quad S_4 \geq kNV(z) \frac{(u-1)e^\gamma f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right)}{v} + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right),$$

$$(3.20) \quad S' \ll N^{1-1/2v}.$$

Here f_k and F_k are the lower and upper sieve functions of the Diamond-Halberstam-Richert sieve of dimension k , and $w(u)$ is the Buchstab function.

We now establish Proposition 2.2 from Proposition 3.1.

Given u, v satisfying the conditions of Proposition 3.1 we then have that for N sufficiently large

$$(3.21) \quad S \geq NV(z) \left((\tau - ku)f_k(v) - kI_1 + kI_2 + \frac{(u-1)ke^\gamma}{v} f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) \right) + o\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k}\right),$$

where

$$(3.22) \quad I_1 = \int_{1/v}^{1/u} \min\left(F_k(v(1-s)), e^\gamma F_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right)w(v(1-s))\right) \frac{1-us}{s} ds,$$

$$(3.23) \quad I_2 = \int_{1/u}^{1-1/v} \max\left(f_k(v(1-s)), e^\gamma f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right)w(v(1-s))\right) \frac{us-1}{s} ds.$$

We have that

$$(3.24) \quad V(z) \gg \frac{N}{(\log N)^k},$$

and so

$$(3.25) \quad S \geq NV(z) \left((\tau - ku)f_k(v) - kI_1 + kI_2 + \frac{(u-1)ke^\gamma}{v} f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) + o(1) \right).$$

If $v > \beta_k$ then $f_k(v) > 0$. Thus we have that $S > 0$ provided N is sufficiently large and provided

$$(3.26) \quad \tau > uk + \frac{k}{f_k(v)} \left(I_1 - I_2 - \frac{(u-1)e^\gamma}{v} f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) \right)$$

Therefore under these assumptions the k -tuple has at most $r_k = \lfloor \tau \rfloor$ prime factors infinitely often. Thus Proposition 2.2 holds.

4. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1

We first let N be sufficiently large so that $L_i(n)$ is strictly increasing for $n \geq N$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ (this happens because $a_i > 0$ for all i by Hypothesis 1). In particular $\Pi(n_1) \neq \Pi(n_2)$ for any $n_1 \neq n_2$ with $n_1, n_2 \geq N$. This assumption is not strictly necessary, but simplifies notation since we do not have to address set/sequence issues.

We first consider S_1 . The sum in S_1 is already of the correct form to be estimated. We let

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{A} = \{\Pi(n) : N \leq n < 2N\},$$

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{A}_d = \{a \in \mathcal{A} : a \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\},$$

and $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of primes.

We use the standard sieve notation $S(\mathcal{B}, Q, z)$ to denote the number of elements of the set $\mathcal{B}$ which are coprime to all the primes in the set Q that are less than z . We see that

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1}} 1 = S(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}, z).$$

By virtue of our normalization from Hypothesis 1 we have that

$$(4.4) \quad \#\mathcal{A}_d = g(d)N + O(k^{\omega(d)}),$$

where $g(d)$ is the multiplicative function defined by

$$(4.5) \quad g(p) = \begin{cases} k, & p \nmid A, \\ 0, & p \mid A. \end{cases}$$

Thus applying [2][Theorem 9.1] (with the y from their notation taken to be $N(\log N)^{-6k}$) and recalling that $z = N^{1/\nu}$ we obtain

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} S(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}, z) &\geq N \prod_{\substack{p < z \\ p \nmid A}} \left(1 - \frac{k}{p}\right) \left(f_k \left(v - 6k \frac{\log \log N}{\log N}\right) + O\left(\frac{(\log \log N)^2}{(\log N)^{1/(2k+2)}}\right)\right) \\ &\quad + O\left(\sum_{m < N(\log N)^{-6k}} \mu^2(m)(4k)^{\omega(m)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where f_k is the Diamond-Halberstam-Richert lower sieve function of dimension k .

We see that

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{m < N(\log N)^{-2k}} \mu^2(m)(4k)^{\omega(m)} &\leq N(\log N)^{-6k} \sum_{m < N} \frac{\mu^2(m)(4k)^{\omega(m)}}{m} \\ &\leq N(\log N)^{-6k} \prod_{p < N} \left(1 + \frac{4k}{p}\right) \\ &\ll N(\log N)^{-2k}. \end{aligned}$$

By our construction of A have that

$$(4.8) \quad V(z) = \prod_{\substack{p < z \\ p \nmid A}} \left(1 - \frac{k}{p}\right) \asymp (\log z)^{-k} \asymp (\log N)^{-k},$$

and so the error term contributes a negligible amount.

By [2][Theorem 6.1] $f_k(x)$ satisfies a Lipschitz condition for $x \geq 1$. Therefore

$$(4.9) \quad S(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}, z) \geq NV(z) \left(f_k(v) + O\left(\frac{1}{\log \log N}\right) \right).$$

We recall that $y = N^{1/u}$ for some fixed constant u . Thus provided $\tau \geq ku$ we have

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} S_1 &= \left(\tau - ku + O\left(\frac{1}{\log N}\right) \right) S(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}, z) \\ &\geq (\tau - ku)NV(z)f_k(v) + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We now consider the sum S_2 . We will obtain two different upper bounds for the inner sum in S_2 , one of which will give stronger results when p is small, and the other will cover the case when p is large. We first note that

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} S_2 &= \sum_{z \leq p < y} \left(1 - \frac{\log p}{\log y} \right) \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ p|L_j(n)}} 1 \\ &= \sum_{z \leq p < y} \left(1 - \frac{\log p}{\log y} \right) S(\mathcal{A}_p, \mathcal{P}, z). \end{aligned}$$

We can use [2][Theorem 9.1] to give an upper bound in the same manner as our bound for S_1 . This gives (using the y from their notation as $N(\log N)^{-2k-5}/p$)

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} S(\mathcal{A}_p, \mathcal{P}, z) &\leq \frac{k}{p} NV(z) \left(F_k\left(v - v \frac{\log p}{\log N}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\log \log N}\right) \right) \\ &\quad + O\left(\sum_{d \leq N(\log N)^{-2k-5}/p} \mu^2(d) 4^{\omega(d)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus summing over $p \in [P, 2P]$ and treating the error term as before we obtain

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{P \leq p < 2P} \left(1 - \frac{\log p}{\log y} \right) S(\mathcal{A}_p, \mathcal{P}, z) &\leq \frac{k \log 2}{\log P} \left(1 - \frac{\log P}{\log y} \right) NV(z) F_k\left(v - v \frac{\log P}{\log N}\right) \\ &\quad + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log P)(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right). \end{aligned}$$

When P is small the above bound provides a good estimate, but when P is large we can do better. We define

$$(4.14) \quad \Pi^{(j)}(n) = \prod_{i \neq j} L_i(n),$$

$$(4.15) \quad \mathcal{A}^{(j)} = \{\Pi^{(j)}(n) : N \leq n < 2N, (L_j(n), P(z)) = 1\},$$

$$(4.16) \quad \mathcal{A}^{(j,d)} = \{\Pi^{(j)}(n) : N \leq n < 2N, (L_j(n), P(z)) = 1, L_j(n) \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\}.$$

We then see that, since our forms are coprime by Hypothesis 1 we have

$$(4.17) \quad S(\mathcal{A}_p, \mathcal{P}, z) = \sum_{j=1}^k S(\mathcal{A}^{(j,p)}, \mathcal{P}, z).$$

The terms $S(\mathcal{A}^{(j,p)}, \mathcal{P}, z)$ correspond to $k-1$ dimensional sieves rather than a k dimensional sieve. Reducing the sieve dimension in this way can improve estimates, but the set of

$n \in [N, 2N)$ such that $(L_j(n), P(z)) = 1$ does not have as strong level of distribution results, which means that this step is only useful when p is relatively large.

Since any $L_j(n)$ can have at most $\lfloor v \rfloor$ prime factors if $(L_j(n), P(z)) = 1$ and N is sufficiently large, we have

$$(4.18) \quad \sum_{P \leq p < 2P} S(\mathcal{A}^{(j,p)}, \mathcal{P}, z) = \sum_{r=1}^{\lfloor v+1 \rfloor} S(\mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)}, \mathcal{P}, z) + O(S'_p),$$

where

$$(4.19) \quad \mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)} = \{ \Pi^{(j)}(n) : N \leq n < 2N, (L_j(n), P(z)) = 1, \\ L_j(n) \text{ has at least } r \text{ prime factors in } [P, 2P) \},$$

$$(4.20) \quad S'_p = \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z)) = 1 \\ p^2 | \Pi(n) \text{ for some } p \in [P, 2P)}} 1.$$

We define

$$(4.21) \quad f_{P,r}(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & n \text{ has at least } r \text{ prime factors in } [P, 2P) \text{ and } (n, P(z)) = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

To estimate $S(\mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)}, \mathcal{P}, z)$ we wish to estimate the number of elements $\#(\mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)})_d$ of $\mathcal{B}_{P,r}$ which are a multiple of some integer d .

We see that $\#(\mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)})_d = 0$ unless $(d, A) = 1$ by Hypothesis 1. If $(d, A) = 1$ then we have

$$(4.22) \quad \#(\mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)})_d = \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ d | \Pi^{(j)}(n)}} f_{P,r}(L_j(n))$$

$$(4.23) \quad = \sum_{\substack{d_1 \dots d_k = d \\ d_j = 1}} \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ d_i | L_i(n) \forall i}} f_{P,r}(a_j n + b_j)$$

We let $m = a_j n + b_j$ so $a_j N + b_j \leq m < 2a_j N + b_j$ and $m \equiv b_j \pmod{a_j}$. The condition $d_i | L_i(n)$ introduces the condition $a_i m \equiv a_i b_j - a_j b_i \pmod{d_i}$ since $(a_j, d_i) = 1$ (because $(d, A) = 1$). We combine all these congruence conditions via the Chinese Remainder Theorem to give $m \equiv m_0 \pmod{a_j d}$ for some m_0 . By Hypothesis 1 we see that m_0 is coprime to $a_j d$. Thus

$$(4.24) \quad \#(\mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)})_d = \sum_{\substack{d_1 \dots d_k = d \\ d_j = 1}} \sum_{\substack{a_j N + b_j \leq m < 2a_j N + b_j \\ m \equiv m_0 \pmod{a_j d}}} f_{P,r}(m)$$

$$(4.25) \quad = \sum_{\substack{d_1 \dots d_k = d \\ d_j = 1}} \left(\frac{X_{P,r}^{(j)}}{\phi(d)} + O(E_{P,r}(d)) \right).$$

Here

$$(4.26) \quad X_{P,r}^{(j)} = \frac{1}{\phi(a_j)} \sum_{a_j N + b_j \leq m < 2a_j N + b_j} f_{P,r}(m),$$

$$(4.27) \quad E_{P,r}(q) = \max_{(a,q)=1} \left| \sum_{\substack{a_j N + b_j \leq m < 2a_j N + b_j \\ m \equiv a \pmod{q}}} f_{P,r}(m) - \frac{\phi(a_j)}{\phi(q)} X_{P,r}^{(j)} \right|.$$

The function $f_{P,r}$ is a sum of $O(1)$ characteristic functions of numbers with a fixed number of prime factors (at most $\lfloor v \rfloor$) where the prime factors lie in specific intervals (each factor is prescribed to be in one of $[z, P)$, $[P, 2P)$ or $[2P, N)$). By Motohashi [6] all these characteristic functions have level of distribution equal to $1/2$. Therefore all of the $f_{P,r}$ have level of distribution equal to $1/2$. In particular for any constant C there exists a constant $C'(C)$ such that

$$(4.28) \quad \sum_{q \leq N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-C'(C)}} \mu^2(q)(4k)^{\omega(q)} E_{P,r}(q) \ll N(\log N)^{-C}.$$

Thus if

$$(4.29) \quad (\mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)})_d = \{b \in \mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)} : b \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\}$$

then from Hypothesis 1 we have

$$(4.30) \quad \#(\mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)})_d = g(d)X_{P,r}^{(j)} + O((k-1)^{\omega(d)}E_{P,r}(a_j d))$$

where $g(d)$ is the multiplicative function defined by

$$(4.31) \quad g(p) = \begin{cases} \frac{k-1}{p-1}, & p \nmid A, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

With this we can now apply [2][Theorem 9.1]. We obtain (taking the y from their notation to be $N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-C'(2k)}$)

$$(4.32) \quad \begin{aligned} S(\mathcal{B}_{P,r}^{(j)}, \mathcal{P}, z) &\leq X_{P,r}^{(j)} \prod_{\substack{p < z \\ p \nmid A}} \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{p-1}\right) \left(F_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) + O\left(\frac{\log \log N}{\log N}\right)\right) \\ &\quad + O\left(\sum_{q \leq N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-C'(2k)}} \mu^2(q)(4k)^{\omega(q)} E_{P,r}(q)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We see from (4.28) that last term is $O(N(\log N)^{-2k})$.

We notice that by Merten's theorem

$$(4.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \prod_{\substack{p < z \\ p \nmid A}} \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{p-1}\right) &= \prod_{\substack{p < z \\ p \nmid A}} \left(1 - \frac{k}{p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1} \\ &= V(z) \left(\frac{e^\gamma \phi(A) \log z}{A} + O(1)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We are therefore left to evaluate the terms $X_{p,r}^{(j)}$. We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{r=1}^{\lfloor v+1 \rfloor} X_{p,r}^{(j)} &= \frac{1}{\phi(a_j)} \sum_{\substack{a_j N + b_j \leq m < 2a_j N + b_j \\ (m, P(z))=1}} \sum_{\substack{P \leq p < 2P \\ p|m}} 1 \\
 &= \frac{1}{\phi(a_j)} \sum_{\substack{a_j N \leq m < 2a_j N \\ (m, P(z))=1}} \sum_{\substack{P \leq p < 2P \\ p|m}} 1 + O(1) \\
 (4.34) \quad &= \frac{1}{\phi(a_j)} \sum_{P \leq p < 2P} \sum_{\substack{a_j N/p \leq n < 2a_j N/p \\ (n, P(z))=1}} 1 + O(1)
 \end{aligned}$$

We can evaluate the inner sum asymptotically. By [5][Theorem 7.11] we have

$$(4.35) \quad \sum_{\substack{a_j N/p \leq n < 2a_j N/p \\ (n, P(z))=1}} 1 = w\left(v - v \frac{\log p}{\log N}\right) \frac{a_j N}{p \log z} + O\left(\frac{N}{p(\log N)^2}\right),$$

where $w(u)$ is the Buchstab function defined by the delay differential equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 w(u) &= u^{-1}, & \text{for } 1 \leq u \leq 2, \\
 (uw(u))' &= w(u-1), & \text{for } u > 2.
 \end{aligned}
 \quad (4.36)$$

Putting together (4.34) and (4.35) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{r=1}^{\lfloor v+1 \rfloor} X_{p,r}^{(j)} &= \frac{a_j N}{\phi(a_j) \log z} \sum_{P \leq p < 2P} \frac{1}{p} w\left(v - v \frac{\log p}{\log N}\right) + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log P)(\log N)^2}\right) \\
 (4.37) \quad &= \frac{a_j N \log 2}{\phi(a_j)(\log P)(\log z)} w\left(v - v \frac{\log P}{\log N}\right) + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log P)(\log N)^2}\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Substituting (4.33), (4.37) and (4.32) into (4.18) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{P \leq p < 2P} S(\mathcal{A}_p^{(j)}, \mathcal{P}, z) &\leq \frac{e^\gamma \phi(A) a_j \log 2}{A \phi(a_j) \log P} NV(z) F_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) w\left(v - v \frac{\log P}{\log N}\right) \\
 (4.38) \quad &+ O\left(\frac{N}{(\log P)(\log N)^k (\log \log N)}\right) + O(S'_p).
 \end{aligned}$$

By Hypothesis 1, a_j and A have the same prime factors (ignoring multiplicity). Thus $\phi(A)a_j = A\phi(a_j)$. Using this, and combining (4.38) with (4.17) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{P \leq p < 2P} S(\mathcal{A}_p, \mathcal{P}, z) &\leq \frac{ke^\gamma \log 2}{\log P} NV(z) F_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) w\left(v - v \frac{\log P}{\log N}\right) \\
 (4.39) \quad &+ O\left(\frac{N}{(\log P)(\log N)^k (\log \log N)}\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

To ease notation we let $s = \log P / \log N$ and recall that $y = N^{1/u}$. Combining (4.39) with (4.13) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{p \leq p < 2P} \left(1 - \frac{\log p}{\log y}\right) S(\mathcal{A}_p, \mathcal{P}, z) \\
 & \leq \frac{k(1-us)NV(z) \log 2}{s \log N} \min\left(F_k(v-vs), e^\gamma F_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) w(v-vs)\right) \\
 & + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log P)(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right) + O(S'_p).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4.40}$$

An application of partial summation now gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_2 &= \sum_{z \leq p < y} \left(1 - \frac{\log p}{\log y}\right) S(\mathcal{A}_p, \mathcal{P}, z) \\
 &\leq kNV(z) \int_{1/v}^{1/u} \min\left(F_k(v-vs), e^\gamma F_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) w(v-vs)\right) \frac{1-us}{s} ds \\
 &+ O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right) + O(S').
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4.41}$$

Exactly the same argument allows us to bound S_3 from below. Using the lower bounds in place of the upper bounds, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_3 &= \sum_{y \leq p < AN/z} \left(\frac{\log p}{\log y} - 1\right) S(\mathcal{A}_p, \mathcal{P}, z) \\
 &\geq kNV(z) \int_{1/u}^{1-1/v} \max\left(f_k(v-vs), e^\gamma f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) w(v-vs)\right) \frac{us-1}{s} ds \\
 &+ O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right) + O(S').
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4.42}$$

We now bound S_4 . We see that

$$S_4 = \left(\frac{\log N}{\log y} - 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log N}\right)\right) \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ (\Pi(n), P(z))=1 \\ L_j(n) \text{ prime}}} 1
 \tag{4.43}$$

$$= \left(\frac{\log N}{\log y} - 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log N}\right)\right) \sum_{j=1}^k S(C^{(j)}, \mathcal{P}, z),
 \tag{4.44}$$

where

$$C^{(j)} = \{\Pi^{(j)}(n) : N \leq n < 2N, L_j(n) \text{ prime}\}.
 \tag{4.45}$$

We let

$$\begin{aligned}
 \#(C^{(j)})_d &= \#\{c \in C^{(j)} : c \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\} \\
 &= g(d) \#C^{(j)} + (k-1)^{\omega(d)} E(d),
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4.46}$$

where $g(d)$ is the multiplicative function defined by (4.31).

By the Bombieri-Vinogradov theorem, for any constant C there is a $C' = C'(C)$ such that

$$\sum_{q \leq N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-C'}} \mu^2(q) (4k)^{\omega(q)} |E(q)| \ll N(\log N)^{-C}.
 \tag{4.47}$$

Thus we can apply [2][Theorem 9.1] (with y from their notation as $N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-C'}$) to give

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(C^{(j)}, \mathcal{P}, z) &\geq \#C^{(j)} \prod_{\substack{p < z \\ p \nmid A}} \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{p-1}\right) f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right) \\
 &= \left(\frac{N}{\log N} + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^2}\right)\right) V(z) (e^\gamma \log z + O(1)) f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) \\
 &\quad + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right) \\
 (4.48) \quad &= \frac{NV(z)e^\gamma f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right)}{v} + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(4.49) \quad S_4 \geq kNV(z) \frac{(u-1)e^\gamma f_{k-1}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right)}{v} + O\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^k \log \log N}\right).$$

Lastly we bound S' . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 S' &\ll \log N \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ \Pi(n) \text{ not square-free}}} 1 \\
 &\ll \log N \sum_{z \leq p \ll N^{1/2}} \sum_{\substack{N \leq n < 2N \\ p^2 | \Pi(n)}} 1 \\
 &\ll \log N \sum_{z \leq p \ll N^{1/2}} \left(\frac{kN}{p^2} + O(1)\right) \\
 &\ll \frac{N \log^2 N}{z} + N^{1/2} \\
 (4.50) \quad &\ll N^{1-1/2v}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus Proposition 3.1 holds.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof Heath-Brown for many helpful comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] CHEN, J. R. On the representation of a larger even integer as the sum of a prime and the product of at most two primes. *Sci. Sinica* 16 (1973), 157–176.
- [2] DIAMOND, H., AND HALBERSTAM, H. Some applications of sieves of dimension exceeding 1. In *Sieve methods, exponential sums, and their applications in number theory (Cardiff, 1995)*, vol. 237 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 101–107.
- [3] HEATH-BROWN, D. R. Almost-prime k -tuples. *Mathematika* 44, 2 (1997), 245–266.
- [4] MAYNARD, J. Almost-prime k -tuples. Pre-print, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1205.4610v1>.
- [5] MONTGOMERY, H. L., AND VAUGHAN, R. C. *Multiplicative number theory. I. Classical theory*, vol. 97 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [6] MOTOHASHI, Y. An induction principle for the generalization of Bombieri's prime number theorem. *Proc. Japan Acad.* 52, 6 (1976), 273–275.
- [7] PORTER, J. W. Some numerical results in the Selberg sieve method. *Acta Arith.* 20 (1972), 417–421.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, 24-29 ST GILES', OXFORD, OX1 3LB

E-mail address: `maynard@math.ox.ac.uk`